

Mr. F. further observed, that he could readily anticipate many of the arguments that would be brought forward in the defence of Congressional Caucuses. One of them would be, that they were necessary to prevent the election from going into the House of Representatives; for if it goes into the House, the choice will be made by States—each State giving but one vote. At first appearance, this is a plausible argument, but it will not bear examination. The Federal Constitution, it must be kept in view, is a work of *compromise*. When the members from the different States met in convention to form a Constitution, they soon found, that it was a work of immense difficulty. So conflicting were the feelings, interests and views of the several states, we are told, that at one time, they were on the point of breaking up and returning home, without having come to any conclusions; but inspired by the spirit of patriotism, they renewed their labors. Each section of the country gave up some of its views in order to gain other; and thus by mutual *compromise*, they formed the Federal Constitution, which never would have been formed on any other principles. Mr. F. said he would very briefly notice three of the principles of compromise adopted in the Constitution. The first was, that the small States should be protected from the overwhelming influence of the great ones, by being admitted to an equal weight in the Senate. Without a concession of this kind in their favor, the small states would never have gone into the union. The next *compromise* was in favor of the Southern States—the partial representation of our slave population, by which we gain one-third of our weight in the House of Representatives. The Southern States never would have adopted the Constitution without some provision of this nature. The third principle of compromise, is intended further to operate in favor of the small States;—it is, when the nation fails to elect the President, that then the election shall be made by the States—each giving one vote. Mr. Madison, in his remarks in the Virginia Convention, speaks of this part of the Constitution as an important *compromise*, designed to conciliate the small states. This, then, is a *compromise*, and the avowed object of a Caucus is to defeat this provision of the Constitution. Heretofore, Caucuses were against party—now they are against the Constitution! What would we say, if the Members from the non-slave holding States were to go into Caucus to defeat that part of the Constitution, which allows three-fifths of our slaves to be represented, and thus to deprive us of one-third of our weight in the General Government? Would we quietly permit them to do so? No—we would cry treason! and march either to defend the Constitution or to dissolve the Union. Now, cannot the small States with equal justice, cry out against a Caucus, that scheme to destroy the provisions of the Constitution intended to operate in their favor? Surely they can! We should not forget the golden rule of doing to others, as we wish others to do unto us.—One part of the Constitution is as sacred as the rest; if any part is more so than others, it certainly ought to be those parts formed on the principles of concession and compromise:—these it were that brought the States together, and a violation of these, more apt than any other, may dissolve the Union. To hold a Caucus, then, by Members of Congress, for the purpose of defeating the express provisions of the Constitution, is certainly doing what they have solemnly sworn not to do—it is violating the Constitution, is cheating the smaller states out of their just powers, and the people out of their rights.